| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 09/689,243 | VARMA, SUBIR |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| • | Daniel K Lam | 2667 |
| Il Participants: Status of Application: | | |
| (1) <u>Daniel K Lam</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Mr. Anatoly S. Welser, attorney for the applicant. (4) | | |
| Date of Interview: 7 May 2004 Time: | | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| | | |
| Claims discussed: | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: The amended claim 14 incorretly depends on the original claim 12 which has been cancelled. The amended claim 14 depends on claim 11 and is agreed by Mr Welser. | | |
| Part III. | | |
| ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview | | |
| did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. | | |
| | • | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Danil H. La | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |